

May 24, 1975

Dear Harold and Jim,

Harold, thanks for your letters of 5/14, 5/15, ~~xx~~ and 5/17; Jim, for yours of 5/15. Since the subject matter overlaps, I am replying jointly, and since Harold mentioned trouble with his mail, I am sending two copies to Jim.

The story on the 1/22 transcript got front-page space ~~xx~~ in the Sunday S.F. Examiner, and a large story on about page 4 in the L.A. ~~xxx~~ Times. Also, a non-AP story in the L.A. Free Press, by Tom Thompson, who has a continuing interest in the assassination. Harold, thanks for mentioning my name to the reporters.

You both might be interested in the Archives response to me when I asked when the decision was made to ~~xxxx~~ release the 1/22 transcript: before or after they received Jim's letter of 3/12. I was told (letter of 4/15) that the decision to release was made before they got the letter, but a copy had not been sent to me ~~because~~ because of the ~~xxx~~ increased work load, etc. I believe this, since the transcript must have been typed up some time before it was released and that could account for a lot of the ~~delay~~ delay in responding to the original request.

get
I have all the Nosenko documents which were just released ~~xxx~~ (as listed in Jim's letter). Apparently they were released as a result of the review of the Nosenko name file I asked for in a letter of June 25, 1974. (They sure took ~~threw~~ ~~xx~~ their time, but I don't find the timing of the eventual release suspicious.) I also have some earlier items mentioning Nosenko (including several in the big 1973 release), but nothing really sensational.

get
I got one other item released ~~xxxx~~ which might interest you: a large undated memo by Coleman and Slawson on evidence relating to foreign involvement. It is generally good; I think the ~~juiciest~~ juiciest part was the discussion of the Odio incident which I cited on p. 25 of my memo on the CIA (which you both have).

Harold, thanks for the ~~xxxx~~ permission on the anthology. It is being put together in more haste than I would like, so our initial letter didn't explain things very fully, but I am optimistic about it.

I was at the LA conference, which I thought was quite good. A week earlier (5/11) Slawson and Mosk ~~xx~~ had a generally ~~xx~~ unsatisfactory but important article in the LA Times. They did say that the CIA withholding - Castro assassination stuff should be investigated.

Jim, I talked about the spectro ~~problem~~ problem a bit with David, who (unlike me) has some special training in spectroscopy. I don't know of any general texts ~~xxx~~ or articles I could send you; he might. I do know of one person here who is in NAA and whom I could approach. I do suspect that the raw data should be looked at by someone who has experience in picking out fudging in scientific analysis. The group I was in at the Rad Lab here has quite a reputation for this, and I would be glad to give it a try, but I don't think I could be ~~g~~ helpful except by looking at the raw material myself. By the way, did you get any reports of the results? Hoover's very carefully phrased letter ~~xxxx~~ couldn't have come from the raw data.

Sincerely,

Paul

PLH